

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| PPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/428,384 | 10/28/1999 | STEPHEN WILLARD DICKSON | 15311-2207 | 4583 | |
| 759 | 00 04/21/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| IP Administrat | ion Legal Dept. | | LY, A | NH | |
| Hewlett-Packard | | 4 | | | |
| P.O. Box 272400 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Fort Collins, CO | 80527-2400 | | 2172 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004 | 1 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | <u></u> |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| N designant Action | 09/428,384 | DICKSON, STEPHEN WILLARD | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| • | Anh Ly | 2172 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl | ation. A proper reply n places the applica | y to a tion in |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | • |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. | on. See MPEP |
| fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final | opriate extension Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or sir | mplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE: | ng a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claim | S. |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed | amendment |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NO | T place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were | e newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-37</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | |) |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied applied on is a) | | 11 9 | Λ () II |
| 9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | — Of 1 (| |
| 10. Other: | | ALFORD PRIMARY E | (INDRED EXAMINER |
| | | 1.4. | |



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argued that, "There is no teach or suggestion by Loucks for a single message that can somehow request a plurality of tokens." (Page 11, lines 12-14).

Loucks et al. of 5,634,122 (hereinafter Loucks) teaches a system for managing shared data in a data processing and the system is for requesting shared resource operations through an export protocol, granting tokens from the operation token requester (see fig. 9, abstract and 10, lines 62-67 and col. 11, lines 1-32; also see col. 6, lines 30-35, col. 7, lines 7-12 and col. 1, lines 35-48). The function of token requester, item 418 of fig. 4, is used to request tokens from token manager (col. 6, lines 1-35). Also the invention of Loucks may have various modifications and changes without departing from its true spirit: processing message(s) or operation(s) with multiple tokens from token manager (col. 11, lines 32-36).